## Stage 1 Constructability Review Recommendations

Project Manager contacts Area Engineer (Construction Manager) three weeks prior to the Review to coordinate time and places.

Stage 1 Plans are 25% complete. In this review the four criteria are Plans, Site Investigation, Utilities and Right of Way, and General Considerations.

### **Stage 1 Documents**

- Stage 1 Plans
- Environmental Summary (Draft Document)
- Description of all permits needed
- Firm line/grade/geometric layout
- Abbreviated Engineer's Assessment
- Design Exception
- Mainline Culvert Hydraulics Report
- Bridge Hydraulics Report
- Bridge Structure Economic Analysis
- Cost Estimate
- Commitment Report

#### **Commonly Missed Items to Check**

- The designer should have some indication of what permits will be needed for the contract at 25% plans. If this includes the geometric layout then impacts should be determined. The designer should compile a list of permits which may be pertinent at this time. (USACE, RGP, NWP, etc) Although the designer cannot apply at this point due to the limited amount of details, all permits should be discussed and listed so that additional permits can be added or other permits can be omitted in the future.
- The existing right of way (if applicable) should be shown at this point. INDOT should verify that the right of way shown on the 25% plans is actually owned by INDOT. If not, and this does happen, there will be time to remedy this during the new right of way procurement.
- Verify the structure of the existing road way, do cores of the existing pavement and shoulder need to be taken? If so, at what locations should cores be taken? The existing pavement may affect MOT, pavement removal, etc.



# Indiana Department of Transportation

## **Project Constructability Review 1**

### Stage 1 Plan Review Submission

Primary DES No Contract No								
Route District		rict					<del></del>	
Work Type RFC Date		Date						
P	Project Location							
P	roject Description							
C	county/City/Town Desi	gner						
Ρ	roject Manager							
R	Reviewed by	Title						
		Date						
			Υ	N	NA	Note	Flag	
٩	Plans				_			
Ì	1. Do plans accurately show existing field condition	ons?						
*	2. Are control points included and are accurate to existing conditions?	match the work to			:			
*	3. Are control points noted from project limits to p	oroject limits?						
*	4. Control points enedia be on bear class of a cir						<u> </u>	
*	5. Have all structures been evaluated for prestres steel beams?	ssed concrete vs.		ļ				
*	<ol><li>Permits for overlength loads to the job feasible</li></ol>							
*								
*	8. Is there adequate structure vertical clearance of travelway?	over entire project			<u> </u>			
*	9. Can overloads/widths be hauled through job?		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	ļ	
*	10. Ale track tarriaroura areas available:				<u> </u>		<u> </u>	
*	<ol> <li>Can Bridge large or heavy members be transp limitations on existing roads, bridges, or hauling</li> </ol>	g equipment?						
*	12. Are there any limitations in erecting large (part bridge members? Crane size? Crane transport positions? Costs? Project structure location?	icularly long) heavy ing? Crane erecting						

13. Is minimum bridge vertical clearance shown on the plans?

Project Constructability Review (Stage 1)

<sup>\* -</sup> Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_				7-12-10	
		Υ	N	NA	Note	Flag	
*	14. Is all previous repair work noted on the plans or as-built?						
*	15. Do the channel change layout details appropriately tie into the						
existing channel and surrounding topography?							
*	16. Are the bridge pier and abutment locations designed such that they			j			
	do not conflict with any existing underground utilities or is relocation						
	of the utility planned?						
*	17. Are the bridge pier and abutment locations designed such that they						
	do not conflict with any existing bridge elements that must remain						
	intact during construction?						
*	18. Does the bridge clear roadway width and location of bridge ails						
	accommodate intersection sight distance for any adjacent						
	intersecting roadways?						
*	19. Does proposed drainage function during construction phases?						
*	20. Is storm sewer design appropriate for the project?		<u> </u>				
*	21. Has offsite drainage been considered (beyond construction limits)?						
E	3 Site Investigation			inis ili.			
Ι.	1. Is location survey complete; includes appropriate horizontal &			]			
"	vertical control?						
*	2. Are the project limits appropriate?			<u> </u>			
	3. Are the mainline culverts located appropriate for the project and has						
"	construction phasing been considered?		<u> </u>				
*	4. Is existing drainage affected by the temporary pavement?		1				
_	5. Can overloads/widths be hauled through job?						
1	6. Was construction loading on bridge decks considered during each		1				
l	phase?						
┌	7. What are the locations of Geotech investigations? When were they						
	taken?						
7	8. Has Geotech taken cores of the existing pavement and shoulder to					1	
	verify the structure of the existing roadway? Where were cores		ļ	1			
L	taken?	a bassis -	7 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4	r sassastenii		PERCENSIONAL	
	C. Utilities and R/W		- 150 HS				
Ľ	1. Is utility location & identification in progress?	╀	_			ļ	
Ľ	2. Is subsurface utility exploration (SUE) utilized as appropriate?	<u> </u>					
	3. Is existing right-of-way and property line determination complete?	<u> </u>	<b>_</b>			<u> </u>	
[	4. Check for overhead utility conflicts.		_		<u> </u>		
Γ	* 5. Is there enough room for all permanent retaining wall elements to fit						
	within the proposed R/W?		↓	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
	* 6. Do the structures fit in the R/W?	<u> </u>	1	ļ		<del>                                     </del>	
Γ	* 7. Is there enough work room to build the structures on the RW?		1				
	* 8. Do the structures fit in the R/W?						
Γ	* 9. Is there enough work room to build the structures on the R/W?	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	

Project Constructability Review (Stage 1)

<sup>\* -</sup> Item related to consultant designer evaluation
Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

		Υ	N	NA	Note	Flag
D	. General Considerations	1913 (3/4) 15 (1/4)	10 V. 15	700	100 (100)	
, '-	Have conflicts with other projects in area been identified?					
ı 1	2. Are the typical sections appropriate?					
*	3. Is the horizontal alignment appropriate?					
*	4. Is the vertical alignment appropriate?					
*	5. Is the structure sizing and type selection appropriate?					
*	6. Was adequate notice and review time provided?					
*	7. Are documents developed to an appropriate level for this review?					
*	8. Are quantity and cost estimates developed to an appropriate level for this review?					
*	9. Has a desired completion date been identified & letting date appropriate?					:
*	10. Are appropriate parties involved with this review?					
*	11. Does review indicate project in constructible?					

Note No.	REVIEWER COMMENTS
1	

Project Constructability Review (Stage 1)

<sup>\* -</sup> Item related to consultant designer evaluation

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

Note No.	REVIEWER COMMENTS

(Attach additional sheets as necessary)

Project Constructability Review (Stage 1)

\* - Item related to consultant designer evaluation Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

Note No.	DESIGNER COMMENTS
. <u>.</u>	
"	

(Attach additional sheets as necessary)

Project Constructability Review (Stage 1)

Y - Yes, N - No, NA - Not Applicable, Note - See note number, Flag - Item requires priority attention

<sup>\* -</sup> Item related to consultant designer evaluation